

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the reasons stated below and respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e):

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Shanklin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,578,147) (hereinafter "Shanklin"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the reasons stated below and respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

For a claim to be anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102, each and every claim limitation must be found within the cited prior art reference and arranged as required by the claim. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants respectfully assert that Shanklin does not disclose "receiving packets of network data in a network processor coupled to a network fabric" as recited in claim 1 and similarly in claim 6. The Examiner cites column 3, lines 10-18 of Shanklin as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (6/20/2007), page 2. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Shanklin instead discloses that Figure 1 illustrates a typical computer network, with a local network 10 protected by an intrusion detection system (IDS) sensor 11 in accordance with the invention. Column 3, lines 11-13. Shanklin further discloses that the local network 10 is the network being secured, with the rest of the network being referred to herein as the "external network". Column 3, lines 14-16. Furthermore, Shanklin discloses that it is assumed that local network 10 receives and sends data in "packets", which are switched between network segments via router 12. Column 3, lines 16-18. Hence, Shanklin discloses a local network that receives and sends packets which are switched between network segments via a router.

There is no language in the cited passage that specifically discloses receiving packets of network data in a network processor coupled to a network fabric. Thus,

Shanklin does not disclose all of the limitations of claims 1 and 6, and thus Shanklin does not anticipate claims 1 and 6. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Shanklin does not disclose "forwarding routed network data to the network fabric" as recited in claim 1 and similarly in claim 6. The Examiner cites column 2, line 59 – column 3, line 3 of Shanklin as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (6/20/2007), page 2. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Shanklin instead discloses providing multiple sensors at either the output of a router or inside a switch. Column 2, lines 60-62. Shanklin further discloses that each sensor is identical to the other sensors and is capable of performing the same intrusion detection processing. Column 2, lines 62-64. Additionally, Shanklin discloses that the sensors operate in parallel, and analyze packets to determine if any packet or series of packets has a "signature" that matches one of a collection of known intrusion signatures. Column 2, lines 64-67. Hence, Shanklin discloses having sensors, operating in parallel, to analyze packets to determine if any packet or series of packets has a signature that matches a known intrusion signature.

There is no language in the cited passage that discloses forwarding routed network data to the network fabric. Thus, Shanklin does not disclose all of the limitations of claims 1 and 6, and thus Shanklin does not anticipate claims 1 and 6. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Shanklin does not disclose "coupling selected data from the network data to a parallel pattern detection engine (PPDE), for comparing the selected data in parallel to M sequences of pattern data stored in the PPDE and generating a match output signal when at least one of the M sequences of pattern data compares to a portion of the selected data" as recited in claim 1 and similarly in claim 6. The Examiner cites column 2, line 59 – column 3, line 3 of Shanklin as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (6/20/2007), page 2. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Shanklin instead discloses providing multiple sensors at either the output of a router or inside a switch. Column 2, lines 60-62. Shanklin further discloses that each

sensor is identical to the other sensors and is capable of performing the same intrusion detection processing. Column 2, lines 62-64. Additionally, Shanklin discloses that the sensors operate in parallel, and analyze packets to determine if any packet or series of packets has a "signature" that matches one of a collection of known intrusion signatures. Column 2, lines 64-67. Hence, Shanklin discloses having sensors, operating in parallel, to analyze packets to determine if any packet or series of packets has a signature that matches a known intrusion signature.

There is no language in the cited passage that discloses coupling selected data from the network data to a parallel pattern detection engine (PPDE). Neither is there any language in the cited passage that discloses coupling selected data from the network data to a parallel pattern detection engine (PPDE), for comparing the selected data in parallel to M sequences of pattern data stored in the PPDE. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that discloses generating a match output signal when at least one of the M sequences of pattern data compares to a portion of the selected data. Thus, Shanklin does not disclose all of the limitations of claims 1 and 6, and thus Shanklin does not anticipate claims 1 and 6. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Claims 2-5 each recite combinations of features of independent claim 1, and hence claims 2-5 are not anticipated by Shanklin for at least the above-stated reasons that claim 1 is not anticipated by Shanklin.

Further, claims 7-20 each recite combinations of features of independent claim 6, and hence claims 7-20 are not anticipated by Shanklin for at least the above-stated reasons that claim 6 is not anticipated by Shanklin.

Claims 2-5 and 7-20 recite additional features, which, in combination with the features of the claims upon which they depend, are not anticipated by Shanklin.

For example, Shanklin does not disclose "storing N intrusion signatures in the M PUs sequences of pattern data with corresponding identification (ID) data used to identify which of the N intrusion signatures is detected" as recited in claim 2 and similarly in claim 7. The Examiner cites column 6, lines 25-46 of Shanklin as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (6/20/2007), page 3. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Shanklin instead discloses that "for a software implementation of the load balancing unit 22a or 32a, routing to sensors 21 and 31 can be performed with appropriate modifications to existing router software. Column 6, lines 29-31. Shanklin further discloses that like other IP routing, the decision of which sensor 21 or 31 will receive a particular packet (or session of packets) is determined by an address associated with the sensor. Column 6, lines 32-34. Furthermore, Shanklin discloses that for example, each sensor 21 or 31 might have a unique IP address so that routing is performed as with other IP-addressed destinations. Column 6, lines 34-37. Hence, Shanklin discloses determining which sensor will process a particular packet based on the address associated with the sensor.

There is no language in the cited passage that discloses storing N intrusion signatures in the M PUs sequences of pattern data. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that discloses storing N intrusion signatures in the M PUs sequences of pattern data with corresponding identification (ID) data. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that discloses storing N intrusion signatures in the M PUs sequences of pattern data with corresponding identification (ID) data used to identify which of the N intrusion signatures is detected. Thus, Shanklin does not disclose all of the limitations of claims 2 and 7, and thus Shanklin does not anticipate claims 2 and 7. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Shanklin does not disclose "storing action code indicating action to take in response to detecting a particular one of the N intrusion signatures" as recited in claim 2 and similarly in claim 8. The Examiner cites column 4, lines 54-61 of Shanklin as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (6/20/2007), page 3. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Shanklin instead discloses that a sensor 11 contains a detection engine, which examines each packet incoming to the sensor 11, including its header and payload. Column 4, lines 54-56. Shanklin further discloses that the sensor 11 also analyzes each packet's relationship to adjacent and related packets in the data stream. Column 4, lines 56-58. Additionally, Shanklin discloses that if the analysis indicates misuse, the sensor may act autonomously to take action, such as disconnection, or it may send

an alarm to a separate intrusion detection management station. Column 4, lines 58-62. Hence, Shanklin discloses that a sensor contains a detection engine, which examines each packet incoming to the sensor. Shanklin further discloses analyzing each packet's relationship to adjacent and related packets in the data stream.

There is no language in the cited passage that discloses storing action code indicating action to take in response to detecting a particular one of the N intrusion signatures. Thus, Shanklin does not disclose all of the limitations of claims 2 and 8, and thus Shanklin does not anticipate claims 2 and 8. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Shanklin does not disclose "comparing the selected data to the store N intrusion signatures and generating, at network data speed, a pattern compare signal and particular ID data when a particular one of the N intrusion signatures is detected" as recited in claim 3. The Examiner cites column 2, line 59 – column 3, line 3 of Shanklin as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (6/20/2007), page 4. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Shanklin instead discloses providing multiple sensors at either the output of a router or inside a switch. Column 2, lines 60-62. Shanklin further discloses that each sensor is identical to the other sensors and is capable of performing the same intrusion detection processing. Column 2, lines 62-64. Additionally, Shanklin discloses that the sensors operate in parallel, and analyze packets to determine if any packet or series of packets has a "signature" that matches one of a collection of known intrusion signatures. Column 2, lines 64-67. Hence, Shanklin discloses having sensors, operating in parallel, to analyze packets to determine if any packet or series of packets has a signature that matches a known intrusion signature.

There is no language in the cited passage that discloses comparing the selected data to the store N intrusion signatures. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that discloses generating, at network data speed, a pattern compare signal and particular ID data. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that discloses generating, at network data speed, a pattern compare signal and particular ID data when a particular one of the N intrusion signatures is detected. Thus, Shanklin does

not disclose all of the limitations of claim 3, and thus Shanklin does not anticipate claim 3. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Shanklin does not disclose "executing the action code corresponding to the particular one of the N intrusion signatures detected" as recited in claim 4. The Examiner cites column 4, lines 54-61 of Shanklin as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (6/20/2007), page 4.

Shanklin instead discloses that a sensor 11 contains a detection engine, which examines each packet incoming to the sensor 11, including its header and payload. Column 4, lines 54-56. Shanklin further discloses that the sensor 11 also analyzes each packet's relationship to adjacent and related packets in the data stream. Column 4, lines 56-58. Additionally, Shanklin discloses that if the analysis indicates misuse, the sensor may act autonomously to take action, such as disconnection, or it may send an alarm to a separate intrusion detection management station. Column 4, lines 58-62. Hence, Shanklin discloses that a sensor contains a detection engine, which examines each packet incoming to the sensor. Shanklin further discloses analyzing each packet's relationship to adjacent and related packets in the data stream.

There is no language in the cited passage that discloses executing the action code corresponding to the particular one of the N intrusion signatures detected. Thus, Shanklin does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 3, and thus Shanklin does not anticipate claim 3. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Shanklin does not disclose "an input/output (I/O) interface for coupling data into and out of the PPDE" as recited in claim 4 and similarly in claim 10. The Examiner has not specifically addressed this limitation. The Examiner is reminded that in order to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation, the Examiner must provide a single prior art reference that expressly or inherently describes each and every element as set forth in the claim. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Since the Examiner has not addressed this limitation, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of anticipation in rejecting claims 4 and 10. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Shanklin does not disclose "M processing units (PUs), each of the M PUs having compare circuitry for comparing each of the sequence of input data to pattern data stored in each of the M PUs and generating a compare output, wherein an address pointer selecting the pattern data in each of the M PUs is modified in response to a logic state of the compare output and an operation code stored with the pattern data" as recited in claim 4 and similarly in claim 10. The Examiner has not specifically addressed this limitation. The Examiner is reminded that in order to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation, the Examiner must provide a single prior art reference that expressly or inherently describes each and every element as set forth in the claim. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Since the Examiner has not addressed this limitation, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of anticipation in rejecting claims 4 and 10. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Shanklin does not disclose "an input bus for coupling the sequence of input data to each of the M PUs in parallel" as recited in claim 4 and similarly in claim 10. The Examiner has not specifically addressed this limitation. The Examiner is reminded that in order to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation, the Examiner must provide a single prior art reference that expressly or inherently describes each and every element as set forth in the claim. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Since the Examiner has not addressed this limitation, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of anticipation in rejecting claims 4 and 10. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Shanklin does not disclose "an output bus coupled to the I/O interface for sending output data to the I/O interface" as recited in claim 4 and similarly in claim 10. The Examiner has not specifically addressed this limitation. The Examiner is reminded that in order to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation, the Examiner must provide a single prior art reference that expressly or inherently describes each and every element as set forth in the claim. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Since the Examiner has not addressed this limitation, the Examiner

has not established a *prima facie* case of anticipation in rejecting claims 4 and 10. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Shanklin does not disclose "control circuitry coupled to the I/O interface and coupling control data on a control data bus and identification (ID) on an ID bus to each of the M processing units" as recited in claim 4 and similarly in claim 10. The Examiner has not specifically addressed this limitation. The Examiner is reminded that in order to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation, the Examiner must provide a single prior art reference that expressly or inherently describes each and every element as set forth in the claim. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Since the Examiner has not addressed this limitation, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of anticipation in rejecting claims 4 and 10. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Shanklin does not disclose "ID selection circuitry for selecting a match ID from ID data identifying the M PUs in response to a pattern match signal and match mode data, wherein the match ID and match data corresponding to the match ID are saved in a temporary register as the output data" as recited in claim 4 and similarly in claim 10. The Examiner cites Figure 4 and column 7, lines 1-27 of Shanklin as disclosing the above-cited claim limitations. Office Action (6/20/2007), page 5. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Shanklin instead discloses that Figure 4 illustrates a switch 40 having internal intrusion detection sensors 41. Column 7, lines 20-21. Shanklin further discloses that switch 40 has multiple ports, each having an associated port adapter 44 and each capable of supporting a single end station or another network. Column 7, lines 21-23. Shanklin additionally discloses that packets are forwarded by switch 40 based on the destination address. Column 7, lines 23-24. Hence, Shanklin discloses a switch having internal intrusion detection sensors where packets are forwarded by the switch based on the destination address.

There is no language in the cited passage that discloses ID selection circuitry for selecting a match ID from ID data identifying the M PUs. Neither is there any

language in the cited passage that discloses ID selection circuitry for selecting a match ID from ID data identifying the M PUs in response to a pattern match signal. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that discloses ID selection circuitry for selecting a match ID from ID data identifying the M PUs in response to a pattern match signal and match mode data. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that discloses ID selection circuitry for selecting a match ID from ID data identifying the M PUs in response to a pattern match signal and match mode data, where the match ID and match data corresponding to the match ID are saved in a temporary register. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that discloses ID selection circuitry for selecting a match ID from ID data identifying the M PUs in response to a pattern match signal and match mode data, where the match ID and match data corresponding to the match ID are saved in a temporary register as the output data. Thus, Shanklin does not disclose all of the limitations of claims 4 and 10, and thus Shanklin does not anticipate claims 4 and 10. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Shanklin does not disclose "wherein the PPDE further comprises cascade circuitry coupled from each of the M PUs to one or more adjacent PUs within the M PUs for selectively coupling chain data between one or more groups of two or more adjacent PUs selected from the M PUs in response to the control data" as recited in claim 5 and similarly in claim 11. The Examiner cites Figure 4 and column 4, lines 54-61 of Shanklin as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (6/20/2007), page 6. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Shanklin instead discloses that a sensor 11 contains a detection engine, which examines each packet incoming to the sensor 11, including its header and payload. Column 4, lines 54-56. Shanklin further discloses that the sensor 11 also analyzes each packet's relationship to adjacent and related packets in the data stream. Column 4, lines 56-58. Additionally, Shanklin discloses that if the analysis indicates misuse, the sensor may act autonomously to take action, such as disconnection, or it may send an alarm to a separate intrusion detection management station. Column 4, lines 58-62. Hence, Shanklin discloses that a sensor contains a detection engine, which examines each packet incoming to the sensor. Shanklin further discloses analyzing each packet's relationship to adjacent and related packets in the data stream.

There is no language in the cited passage that discloses where the PPDE further comprises cascade circuitry coupled from each of the M PUs to one or more adjacent PUs within the M PUs. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that discloses where the PPDE further comprises cascade circuitry coupled from each of the M PUs to one or more adjacent PUs within the M PUs for selectively coupling chain data between one or more groups of two or more adjacent PUs selected from the M PUs. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that discloses where the PPDE further comprises cascade circuitry coupled from each of the M PUs to one or more adjacent PUs within the M PUs for selectively coupling chain data between one or more groups of two or more adjacent PUs selected from the M PUs in response to the control data. Thus, Shanklin does not disclose all of the limitations of claims 5 and 11, and thus Shanklin does not anticipate claims 5 and 11. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Shanklin does not disclose "circuitry for receiving packets of network data from the network fabric in the network process; circuitry for analyzing the packets of network data for validity generating valid packets of network data; circuitry for forwarding network data from the valid packets of network data to the PPDE, circuitry for comparing the selected data to the store N intrusion signatures and generating, at network data speed, a pattern compare signal and particular ID data when a particular one of the N intrusion signatures is detected; and circuitry for executing the action code corresponding to the particular one of the N intrusion signatures detected" as recited in claim 9. The Examiner has not specifically addressed these limitations. The Examiner is reminded that in order to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation, the Examiner must provide a single prior art reference that expressly or inherently describes each and every element as set forth in the claim. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Since the Examiner has not addressed these limitations, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of anticipation in rejecting claim 9. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Shanklin does not disclose "wherein the PPDE further comprises an input buffer coupled to the I/O interface for receiving and writing input data as parallel data at a write address" as recited in claim 12. The

Examiner has not specifically addressed this limitation. The Examiner is reminded that in order to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation, the Examiner must provide a single prior art reference that expressly or inherently describes each and every element as set forth in the claim. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Since the Examiner has not addressed this limitation, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of anticipation in rejecting claim 12. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Shanklin does not disclose "wherein the PPDE further comprises a multiplexer coupled to the input bus and the input buffer for sequentially coupling single data from the input buffer data to the input bus, wherein parallel data are selected using a read address" as recited in claim 13. The Examiner has not specifically addressed this limitation. The Examiner is reminded that in order to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation, the Examiner must provide a single prior art reference that expressly or inherently describes each and every element as set forth in the claim. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Since the Examiner has not addressed this limitation, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of anticipation in rejecting claim 13. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Shanklin does not disclose "wherein the PPDE further comprises an output buffer coupled to the output bus and to the temporary register for receiving and writing output data to the output buffer at a write address and coupling output data to the output bus corresponding to a read address" as recited in claim 14. The Examiner has not specifically addressed this limitation. The Examiner is reminded that in order to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation, the Examiner must provide a single prior art reference that expressly or inherently describes each and every element as set forth in the claim. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Since the Examiner has not addressed this limitation, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of anticipation in rejecting claim 14. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Shanklin does not disclose "wherein each of M PUs has an ID register for storing a unique ID sent from the control circuitry" as recited in claim 15. The Examiner has not specifically addressed this limitation. The Examiner is reminded that in order to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation, the Examiner must provide a single prior art reference that expressly or inherently describes each and every element as set forth in the claim. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Since the Examiner has not addressed this limitation, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of anticipation in rejecting claim 15. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Shanklin does not disclose "wherein each of M PUs has a control register for storing the match mode data, wherein the match mode data determines criteria for generating the match signal and the match data" as recited in claim 16. The Examiner has not specifically addressed this limitation. The Examiner is reminded that in order to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation, the Examiner must provide a single prior art reference that expressly or inherently describes each and every element as set forth in the claim. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Since the Examiner has not addressed this limitation, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of anticipation in rejecting claim 16. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Shanklin does not disclose "wherein each of the M PUs has a memory register array for storing a sequence of the pattern data and corresponding operation codes addressed by an address register indexed by the address pointer" as recited in claim 17. The Examiner has not specifically addressed this limitation. The Examiner is reminded that in order to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation, the Examiner must provide a single prior art reference that expressly or inherently describes each and every element as set forth in the claim. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Since the Examiner has not addressed this limitation, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of anticipation in rejecting claim 17. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Shanklin does not disclose "wherein the cascade circuitry enables the stored patterns of two or more M PUs to be chained together as a single pattern using the chain data" as recited in claim 18. The Examiner has not specifically addressed this limitation. The Examiner is reminded that in order to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation, the Examiner must provide a single prior art reference that expressly or inherently describes each and every element as set forth in the claim. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Since the Examiner has not addressed this limitation, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of anticipation in rejecting claim 18. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Shanklin does not disclose "wherein the chain data inhibits indexing the pointer of one PU until an adjacent PU coupled with the cascade circuitry has compared a last pattern data to input data" as recited in claim 19. The Examiner has not specifically addressed this limitation. The Examiner is reminded that in order to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation, the Examiner must provide a single prior art reference that expressly or inherently describes each and every element as set forth in the claim. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Since the Examiner has not addressed this limitation, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of anticipation in rejecting claim 19. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Shanklin does not disclose "wherein the compare circuitry in each of the M PUs completes a compare of input data to selected pattern data and generates a compare output and modifies the address pointer in the same cycle of a clock signal" as recited in claim 20. The Examiner has not specifically addressed this limitation. The Examiner is reminded that in order to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation, the Examiner must provide a single prior art reference that expressly or inherently describes each and every element as set forth in the claim. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Since the Examiner has not addressed this limitation, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of anticipation in rejecting claim 20. M.P.E.P. §2131.

As a result of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully assert that not each and every claim limitation was found within Shanklin, and thus claims 1-20 are not anticipated by Shanklin. M.P.E.P. §2131.

II. CONCLUSION:

As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicants that claims 1-20 in the Application are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request an allowance of such claims. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner call Applicants' attorney at the below listed number if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

WINSTEAD P.C.

Attorneys for Applicants

By: 

Robert A. Voigt, Jr.
Reg. No. 47,159

P.O. Box 50784
Dallas, TX 75201
(512) 370-2832

Austin_1 503583v.1